

### Item 3.

#### Policy - Neighbourhood Parking Policy

File No: X003620.007

#### Summary

In 2017, the Neighbourhood Parking Policy (first adopted on 12 May 2014) was reviewed as part of the standard review process, and an updated draft was endorsed for public exhibition and consultation. The Draft Neighbourhood Parking Policy was exhibited for 79 days. A total of 86 submissions were received.

The Draft Neighbourhood Parking Policy was considered at the meeting of the Transport, Heritage and Planning Committee on 9 April 2018. A number of issues and considerations were raised by speakers and Councillors at the Committee meeting, and the matter was subsequently deferred by Council on 16 April 2018.

Following further review, amendments to the Draft Neighbourhood Parking Policy have been made for consideration. The recommended amendments are as follows:

- (a) That eligible households that have on-site parking and do not have a resident parking permit are eligible for visitor parking permits and carer's parking permits (Clarification: Eligibility for visitor and carer's parking permits).
- (b) That reference to motorcycle parking at clause 2.2 be amended to read "As dedicated motorcycle parking zones increase the number of arrivals and departures from a space due to a higher concentration of vehicles the City will seek to locate these zones in such a way as to minimise noise impacts on residents". (Amendment).
- (c) That proposed clause 11.2 (c) regarding insurance for business use, for business permits be removed.

It is not proposed to make significant changes to the draft policy; the changes proposed largely act to clarify the intent of the policy.

This report seeks approval of the adoption of the Revised Draft Neighbourhood Parking Policy.

#### Recommendation

It is resolved that Council adopt the Revised Draft Neighbourhood Parking Policy 2018, as shown at Attachment A to the subject report.

**Attachments**

- Attachment A.** Revised Draft Neighbourhood Parking Policy 2018
- Attachment B.** Response to Speakers at Committee
- Attachment C.** Report to the Transport, Heritage and Planning Committee on 9 April 2018 (without attachments)
- Attachment D.** Summary of Public Submissions

## Background

1. At the meeting of the Transport, Heritage and Planning Committee on 9 April 2018, Councillors and speakers sought further information on issues related to the Neighbourhood Parking Policy. This report addresses the issues raised by speakers organised by theme.
2. Attachment B lists the issues as they were raised by each speaker, the City's response and recommended action. As a result, the recommended actions are:
  - (a) That eligible households that have on-site parking and do not have a resident parking permit are eligible for visitor parking permits and carers parking permits (Clarification: Eligibility for visitor and carers parking permits).
  - (b) That reference to motorcycle parking at clause 2.2 be amended to read "As dedicated motorcycle parking zones increase the number of arrivals and departures from a space due to a higher concentration of vehicles the City will seek to locate these zones in such a way as to minimise noise impacts on residents". (Amendment).
  - (c) That proposed clause 11.2 (c) regarding insurance for business use, for business permits be removed.
3. The eligibility framework for visitor parking permits was established in the Neighbourhood Parking Policy in 2014. Visitor eligibility aligns closely with that for resident parking permits, and similar eligibility applies to carer's permits. A line had been inadvertently added to the ineligibility list of both visitor and carer permits to include households who do not park on the streets because they have on-site parking. This category should remain eligible for visitor and carers permits in line with the existing 2014 parking policy.
4. It is recommended to remove the line which will maintain (visitor parking permits) or allow (carers) permits for these households. The recommendation reflects this.
5. At the meeting of the Transport, Heritage and Planning Committee, a number of issues and concerns were raised that are discussed in this report.

### Issue: Number, Allocation and Type of Visitor Permits

6. A concern was raised that the method for determining the maximum amount of visitor parking permits that households are entitled to is unfair and that all eligible households should be entitled to the same number of visitor parking permits regardless of the kerbside road space used by a household. This concern is contrary to the existing parking framework arrangements.

**Response:** The method of determining household entitlement to visitor parking permits was adopted in 2014. It holds that kerbside space is a valuable community asset that should be shared fairly. Thus, households who do not usually occupy kerbside space, either because they park on their property or because they do not have a car, have been entitled to a higher number of visitor parking permits than those with resident parking permits who use kerbside road space on a regular basis. On balance, the policy principle of visitor permits being inversely proportional to the number of public parking spaces used by a household is still supported.

7. It was further raised that the driveways of households with on-site parking take up kerbside road space equal to that of households without on-site parking who use resident parking permits.

**Response:** While on-site parking may result in a driveway in some instances, in the areas of eligible households with parking restrictions, most driveways and garages are accessed from rear lanes which are too narrow for parking.

8. A concern was raised that the proposed increase in the number of visitor parking permits issued is insufficient, particularly in an area that had annual permits and with strict time restrictions where visitors may feel less safe walking late at night to their host's house from parking spaces in streets with less strict time limitations. It was suggested that visitor parking permit numbers should be determined at a finer grain level than current reconfigured parking areas so as to respond to local circumstances.

**Response:** Council needs to balance the needs of all road users, including residents, businesses and visitors. The previous major parking policy review sought consistency in the planning framework, and reintroducing an annual parking permit in one area would not achieve this aim. The draft policy recommends a pro rata increase in visitor permits in response to community submissions during the exhibition of the draft policy and no change to the framework. Residents in Pymont with no resident parking permits on street will be eligible for up to 60 visitor parking permits per annum in blocks of 10 (an increase from 45) should Council adopt the policy as recommended.

#### **Issue: Impact of Motorcycles on Liveability**

9. During the submission period, the Motorcycle Council of NSW requested that reference to dedicated motorcycle parking zones and their impact of the liveability of the City be amended to better articulate that the impact of motorcycle parking is due to the concentration of a number of motorcycles in a space(s) which increases the number of vehicle arrivals and departures. An amended clause was therefore included in recommended amendments to the Draft policy.
10. A concern was raised by the Motorcycle Council that this be further amended to make this clearer.

**Response:** The draft policy is recommended for amendment at 2.2 to read "As dedicated motorcycle parking zones increase the number of arrivals and departures from a space due to a higher concentration of vehicles the City will seek to locate these zones in such a way as to minimise noise impacts on residents".

#### **Issue: Parking for Motorcycles**

11. A concern was raised by the Motorcycle Council representative at Committee about the provision of more exclusive parking for motorcycles.

**Response:** Motorcycles are able to park in any on-street parking space, subject to the signposted restrictions. The City also allows motorcycles to park for free in metered spaces, as long as parking restrictions are observed. In addition, there may be exclusive motorcycle parking areas. The City will consider opportunities to install dedicated motorcycle parking at approaches to intersections and corners where sightlines mean vehicles cannot park, and between driveways where there is not enough room for a regular vehicles. However, this provision is subject to the broader concerns about residential amenity.

**Issue: Motorcycle parking in the City Centre**

12. The Neighbourhood Parking Policy does not cover the City Centre. This is addressed by the Central Sydney On-Street Parking Policy which establishes criteria and service objectives for allocating kerbside parking and loading in central Sydney. There is intense competition for use of kerbside space in central Sydney. The City's narrow streets and short east-west blocks limit the useable kerb space that can be safely allocated to support the City's commercial and transport functions. Of the space that is available, the majority is occupied by critical transport infrastructure, including general traffic lanes, turn lanes, bus lanes, light rail and cycle ways.
13. The Central Sydney On-Street Parking Policy prioritises access for critical uses, such as goods delivery, taxi ranks, emergency and essential services parking, coach pick up and set down, and general pick up and set down for hotels and venues. It also prioritises dedicated mobility parking.

**Issue: Park and Ride**

14. Park and ride was discussed. The concept of park and ride at public transport nodes is broadly supported, as it provides an opportunity to intercept private vehicle trips destined for the City Centre and move them to public transport. However, in general, there is limited opportunity or need for park and ride in the City, due to a number of factors:
  - (a) Density of development and transport networks, with most areas served by transit within walking distance.
  - (b) Public transport (bus) networks supporting access to stations.
  - (c) Competition for kerb space around activity hubs and stations.
  - (d) Transport for NSW has a broader program of commuter car parking at suburban rail stations and major bus stops, and motorcycle parking is available in these. These are usually at transport hubs further than 10km from the city centre, outside the City of Sydney local government area (LGA).
15. For these reasons, it is not recommended that the priority for motorcycle parking around public transport nodes in town centres (eg, Newtown) be raised above other uses such as bus stops, taxi zones, mobility parking, loading zones or essential services parking.
16. In other areas, such as near Macdonaldtown Station, parking is used by residents. Any changes to support commuter parking would be unlikely to garner community support, as the result would likely be non-residents of the City driving to City locations to park and access transit that they could have accessed further afield.

**Issue: 4P Parking (unticketed)**

17. A concern was raised by residents from Area 15 about 4P parking in Greens Road.

**Response:** The draft Neighbourhood Parking policy notes that 2 hour parking is a preferred parking control in residential areas because it allows reasonable access for short visits in many instances without the need for visitor parking permits, and is able to be efficiently monitored by Rangers. Widespread unticketed 4P parking is not recommended in the policy although, in some ticketed locations near the arts precinct venues for example, it may be preferred. This is an operational matter rather than policy matter.

**Issue: Car Camping**

18. A concern was raised about the City's capacity to prevent car camping in known trouble-spot streets. It was noted that it is not against the law to sleep or live in a vehicle on a public street, as long as it is legally parked. Under the Local Government Act 1993, "No Camping" signs can only be erected in a park or open space and not on a road. City Rangers can direct people to remove chairs, camping equipment and other items on the street if they observe them obstructing the footpath. However, anti-social behaviour, including urinating or defecating in the street, is the responsibility of the NSW Police.
19. Under the Impounding Act 1993, abandoned vehicles may be removed by the City once the required process is followed. However, if there is proven ownership of the vehicle, the City cannot classify it as abandoned and this means the Rangers cannot remove it. It is an offence to leave an unregistered vehicle on the street; however, the City does not have the authority to issue penalty notices for this offence. The police are responsible for taking action against unregistered vehicles.

**Response:** The Neighbourhood Parking Policy sets out parking controls, such as "2P 8am-6pm", that have been effective in preventing long-stay parking and car camping (such as at Kings Cross) and does provide more parking opportunities for residents and visitors to the area. The City will review the applicable parking controls in areas where this issue is identified from time to time and will apply the parking controls considered most appropriate taking all matters into account.

**Issue: Parking Areas and Parking Zones**

20. A concern was raised in relation to the availability of parking in Kings Cross (Zone A). The Neighbourhood Parking Policy divides the City into a number of parking areas to enable the management of parking pressures at a local level. For example, all parking permit holders are exempt from restrictions (where signposted) in the area in which they live, but not in others.

**Response:** A major review and rationalisation of the parking areas and parking zones took place in 2014. There are 15 neighbourhood parking areas in the City, as well as the Central Sydney parking area. Parking area boundaries generally follow major built or natural features, such as arterial roads, railways and natural boundaries. Parking areas generally increased in size when the Neighbourhood Parking Policy was first adopted in 2014 when 31 areas were rationalised to create 16. There are inevitable variations in land use and parking pressure within an area. The policy therefore developed preferred parking restrictions for a variety of development and activity typologies. While it is not always possible for residents to park outside their property or on their own street, there is likely to be parking nearby.

21. With occupancy levels and compliance around 85%, the City views the fundamentals of the policy are working as designed. It is the City's preference to deal with any particular hotspots by reviewing operational matters where appropriate, including signposted parking restrictions or the level of enforcement of parking.

22. The policy does allow Council to alter Parking Area boundaries where required. This is not proposed as part of the 2018 review of the Neighbourhood Parking Policy. There is a relationship between parking permit availability and parking pressures. Parking areas are zoned 'A' if the number of resident parking permits issued exceeds the number of available parking spaces. In these parking areas eligible households are entitled to one resident parking permit and a lower amount of visitor parking permits. At present, only Area 19, Kings Cross, Elizabeth Bay and Rushcutters Bay is zoned A. (Existing resident parking permit holders were permitted to retain their higher entitlements at the time the area was zoned 'A'.)
23. Parking areas are zoned 'B' if there are fewer resident parking permits issued than available parking spaces. Eligible households in these parking areas are eligible for up to 2 resident parking permits and a higher amount of visitor parking permits, depending on the number of on-site parking spaces they have.

#### **Issue: Car Sharing Policy**

24. A concern was raised about car share spaces taking residential spaces.

**Response:** The Neighbourhood Parking Policy does not regulate the management of dedicated on-street car sharing spaces. This is managed by the City's Car Sharing Policy 2016. Following RMS Technical Direction 07/04 Guidelines for the Implementation of On-Street Car Share Parking the City limits allocation of dedicated car sharing spaces to 5 per cent of parking spaces in each parking area.

25. The Car Sharing Policy identifies the nexus between acceptable use of existing car sharing spaces, and the approval of new spaces in an area. The Car Sharing Policy identifies the processes available to the City to reallocate or remove altogether spaces where use is insufficient to justify the allocation of kerb space.
26. The City does not directly subsidise car share operators. Car share operators cover the cost of installation of car share spaces, and pay an annual permit fee for the use of the space.

#### **Issue: Bike Share and On-Street Bike Parking**

27. A question was raised regarding bike parking on streets.

**Response:** Bike parking is located principally on footpaths via rings. The Draft Policy identifies the potential for active transport parking in town centres (section 3.2).

28. Where there is insufficient space for footpath bike parking, the City has installed on-street bike parking corrals (eg, Little Eveleigh Street Redfern, Hutchison Street Surry Hills, and Crown Street at Rapha) and will provide more in locations which have community support.

#### **Issue: Enforcement and Compliance**

29. Concerns were raised regarding the enforcement and compliance and suggestions that more enforcement is required. The policy recognises that deterrence of non-compliant behaviour is a key element of parking management and sets out the City's approach to managing compliance involving careful planning to monitor areas proactively.

**Response:** The City receives over 12,000 parking complaints annually. Enforcement resources are subject to increasing demand arising from demands on parking and extension of parking controls to existing streets (eg, Glebe, Alexandria, Erskineville), increases in the duration of parking restrictions, land use intensification in some neighbourhoods, especially in the southern LGA, and construction of new public streets in Green Square, Central Park and Harold Park.

30. Presently, City Rangers do not use automated systems such as sensors in the roadway, or camera-mounted systems on vehicles. The City's environment has some challenges in regards to using the technology eg, zone parking, narrow streets, communication, use of permits, and it would decrease Rangers' ability to interact with people on the street, and to explain common road rules.
31. Pay parking can be used to improve compliance because it allows rangers to enforce in a single visit, and more readily respond to complaints. It is in this context of rising parking demand that the policy recommends that pay parking be considered where parking occupancy is high, and compliance is consistently poor despite increased enforcement.

#### **Issue: Visitor Parking Permits - Tradespersons**

32. A concern was raised that the number of tradespersons parking permits was not adequate for all jobs.

**Response:** This is acknowledged and a recommendation for change is included in the draft policy concerning one-day visitor parking permits, which can also be used for tradespeople. Should the draft policy be adopted, households will be eligible for between 10 - 60 one-day visitor parking permits, adding anywhere between 2-12 extra weeks parking to the tradespersons permits. In addition, there is timed parking or pay parking for smaller tasks and works zones for larger projects.

#### **Issue: Business Parking Permits**

33. A concern was raised about how vehicles 'used to carry goods in the course of daily trade' will be assessed. The draft policy broadens the criteria of vehicles that are eligible for a business parking permit to give businesses greater flexibility in managing their businesses. This will allow smaller, more fuel efficient vehicles to be used for business.
34. The current eligibility criteria permits businesses using vehicles that are eligible to park in a loading zone. Businesses who have applied using this criteria give a strong indication of the types of businesses for whom a vehicle is essential to carry goods in the course of daily trade and include: cafes and restaurant, cultural industry such as art galleries and event producers, food and liquor supplies, IT industry.
35. Under the draft Policy, the City would require vehicles to be registered and insured for business use. This requirement was supported by the Sydney Business Chamber. However, there are concerns that this insurance requirement may impact on some small businesses, who may legitimately use vehicles for the purposes set out in the draft policy, but that may not be eligible for that type of insurance. For this reason, it is proposed to remove this requirement, as per the amendment.

**Issue: Skip Bins and Parklets**

36. A concern was raised as to whether it was appropriate to include skip bins in the policy, in a similar way to parklets, as both of these items can be structures that can be placed on the street.

**Response:** The management of skip bins is incorporated into a comprehensive Waste Management – Local Approvals Policy. It is appropriate to keep skip bins in that Policy because it keeps all information about waste management in a single location.

37. Many parklets are also structures. However, the City was requested to develop a policy position regarding the potential deploy of modified, vehicular parklets (ie, trailers). These are vehicles under the road transport legislation, and therefore are subject to parking restrictions - and thus appropriate to be included in the Neighbourhood Parking Policy.

**Administering Permits**

38. Customer Service assesses 24,000 applications annually. All applications are assessed in accordance with the policy:

- (a) The property is eligible.
- (b) Checked for on-site parking spaces.
- (c) Vehicle is correctly registered to the applicant and the address.
- (d) Permits allotted to the property.
- (e) If there are current valid permits issued for the property.
- (f) Vehicle is not a trailer, caravan, truck, bus or tractor.
- (g) There is on-line application and payment for the following permit types:
  - (i) Residential.
  - (ii) Business.
  - (iii) Visitor.

39. Forty three per cent of applications are received online. The online process has logic built in to check eligibility based criteria entered, including address and on-site spaces. The website has an area where customers can check to see if addresses are eligible; this is useful for people moving in to the LGA.

**Key Implications****Managing Street Parking**

40. The issue that received the most submissions (18) was that of the need for greater ranger activity to achieve compliance. Service levels are constantly assessed and operations are adjusted accordingly. Based on community feedback, targeted patrols are also undertaken after hours as needed.

41. The most significant request for changes to time limits was from residents facing significant development pressures. Various requests for changes were made. The policy makes provision for operational changes such as these.
42. The draft revised policy recommended 4P parking not be the preferred parking control in non-ticketed areas. Opposition to this proposal largely came from commuters who drove to work. The City does not support long term commuter parking on-street which is reflected in this Policy. A small number of submissions commented that 4 hour parking was preferred to enable longer family visits. Due to the need to balance demand for parking for residents, businesses and visitors, no change is proposed to the draft policy. Any changes to parking controls in a local area would occur in accordance with Council's existing processes, which are set out at 2.8 in the policy.
43. There were a number of submissions requesting the installation of more unrestricted parking spaces to facilitate parking by residents who were not eligible for parking permits, however these were outnumbered by requests to remove unrestricted parking as it facilitates commuting, long stay parking and camping. The policy does not recommend widespread unrestricted parking.
44. The Restaurant and Catering Association recommended that pay parking in café and boutique retail areas be in place only on weekdays, with free parking on weekends, the busiest periods for these businesses. Free parking reduces vehicle turnover and business revenue and it is not recommended that this request be adopted.
45. Transport for New South Wales and Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) recommend that the policy adopt a hierarchy which should prioritise public and active transport over other modes and that this may have some impact on the location of residential, car share and other on-street parking spaces. The policy was amended to articulate that, in commercial and mixed-use areas, the City will ensure the adequate provision of loading zones, bus zones, drop-off and pick up spaces, mobility parking spaces and bike parking to encourage active travel and public transport.

### **15 Minute Free Parking**

46. A number of submissions, including the Restaurant and Catering Association and Office of Small Business Commissioner, recommended that the trial of 15-minute parking, in place until June 2018, be permanently adopted.
47. Since the City commenced developing its approach to 15 minute free parking in 2013 it has been liaising with RMS regarding the impact of the existing Road Rules on its enforcement. In 2016 following representations, RMS were asked to provide advice to the Minister for Roads, Maritime and Freight about amendments to the Road Rules to address this matter. The City has not yet been advised of the outcomes of that request.
48. Given that the trial is strongly supported, the draft policy recommends continuing the trial. Any proposals to extend 15 minute free parking should occur in the context of extending pay parking to an area.

### **Resident Parking Permits**

49. The exhibited policy did not propose to alter the number of permits offered to households.

- 50. The policy has been amended to clarify that each room of an eligible and approved boarding house will be treated as a separate dwelling eligible for one resident parking permit in both Zone A and Zone B. This is in line with the current policy.
- 51. The policy has been amended to clarify that households in Zone B with a single on-site parking space are eligible for one parking permit only in circumstances where they have a second vehicle.
- 52. The report accompanying the exhibited policy recommended to raise the fee applicable to the first household permit by 50% and the second permit by 15% (see Table 1). Given the second permit price is already double the first permit price, a smaller increase to this permit is recommended to avoid prohibitive costs. A small number of submissions suggested that the price difference should be greater. Given the most expensive permit is \$265, it is considered that a significantly greater increase would be prohibitive, while a more moderate increase still retains the price differential. This is a matter for the Fees and Charges process.

Emissions (tailpipe CO2 g/km combined)		111.9 or less	112–186.5	186.6–261.1	261.2 or more
1st permit	Current	\$27	\$40	\$53	\$106
	Recommended	\$41	\$60	\$80	\$159
2nd permit	Current	\$53	\$80	\$106	\$212
	Recommended	\$61	\$92	\$122	\$244

Table 1. Annual permit prices – current and recommended.

- 53. The most common (56% of permits) permit issued is for vehicles in the 112-186.5 tailpipe CO2 g/km combined category. The price of this permit will increase roughly 38 cents a week.
- 54. Submissions that raised the issue of the cost of permits generally expressed opposition to permit price increases, though a small number of submissions recommended a greater price increase to reflect the scarcity and value of kerb space. It is proposed to retain the existing price for permits for pensioners on full benefits, given pensions are not increasing to the increasing cost of living. This is a matter for the Fees and Charges process.
- 55. It is recommended that the requirement that a household vehicle be registered at a resident's address be amended to formally recognise the City already allows residents with company cars and long term leased vehicles to obtain an annual resident parking permit. This definition is in line with RMS Permit Parking Guidelines 2016.

56. Temporary parking permits were separated into two classes to provide greater clarity regarding different types of temporary permits. It is recommended that the restriction of permit to one temporary construction work parking permit only in 24 months be removed to acknowledge that works will sometimes go over time. This is considered to have minimal impact.

### **Visitor Parking Permits**

57. The draft revised policy proposed to increase the number of one-day visitor permits on offer. Submissions largely supported this, with some requests for a greater allocation. Residents in areas with strict time restrictions, particularly Pymont/Ultimo, were prominent. These requests may be better addressed by fine tuning local time restrictions rather than increasing numbers of permits on offer across the board and it is not recommended to increase the number of visitor permits further at present. The introduction of Visitor Parking Permits – Tradespersons will also reduce the pressure on the need for one-day parking permits.
58. A small number of submissions expressed the view that all households should receive the same number of permits, or that allocation of permits should be more nuanced according to local situations. Kerb space is a valuable community asset and the City attempts to share this resource equitably. Households with a resident parking permit potentially use kerb space 365 days a year, whereas households without a resident parking permit do not use as much kerb space. A small number of submissions expressed concern that an increase in visitor permits would increase pressure on resident parking. Current uptake of visitor permits is low (5% of households) so this is not considered to currently present a risk.
59. Some residents expressed concern that permits cost \$2 each. Given the scarcity of this valuable community asset, and the cost of administering the permit scheme, this modest charge is not unreasonable and it is not proposed to reduce this fee beyond offering a pensioner discount of 50%. Some residents are currently paying more than \$2 per permit, due to the current flat fee structure of \$53 for a full permit allocation.
60. There was general support for enabling the purchase of smaller amounts of a household's entitlement in one transaction.

### **Visitor Parking Permits - Tradespersons**

61. There was overwhelming support for the adoption of Visitor Parking Permits – Tradespersons. Views on the recommended fee of \$53 per week were varied, some submitting that the proposed fee was too high compared to one-day visitor parking permits. Others submitted that it was too low in view of the high value of City kerb space. It is recommended that the fee of \$53 per week be advertised as part of the Fees and Charges process.
62. A number of concerns were raised that the amount of permits (total of six weeks per household) is not enough for some major works, or that a one-week permit does not match tradespersons working patterns. One-day Visitor Parking Permits can also be used for tradespeople and, with most households now eligible for either 40 or 60 visitor parking permits (should the policy be adopted), many households can obtain between 12–14 weeks parking for tradespersons, along with paid parking, timed parking and off-street parking. It is not proposed to alter the number of weekly permits offered.
63. The proposed amendments include an additional requirement that the resident's address be shown on the parking permit, in line with RMS Permit Parking Guidelines 2016.

**Business Parking Permits**

64. There was support for broadening the criteria of vehicles that are eligible for a business parking permit to give businesses greater flexibility in managing their businesses and allow smaller, more fuel efficient vehicles to be used for business purposes.
65. The Sydney Business Chamber requested that there be greater clarity provided about the type of vehicles that would be eligible and how 'used to carry goods in the course of daily trade' will be assessed. The key issue is the need to carry goods. The City will prepare a checklist to set out this assessment process. Should the City determine that a need is proven, the vehicle choice will be a decision for the business. It is considered that the requirement for the vehicle to be registered and insured for a business use will assist in reducing the potential for fraud.

**Business Parking Permits - Tradepersons**

66. The City wrote to RMS providing a copy of the draft policy and requested changes to the Road Transport (General) Regulation 2013 to create a new class of permit. RMS have responded that they agree that the provision of this type of short-term parking is likely to be beneficial and have indicated that they will review both the Road Transport (General) Regulation 2013 and the Permit Parking Guidelines to allow short-term parking for tradespeople visiting businesses. The timeframe for this is to be determined.
67. Annexure A to the policy, as exhibited, has been removed from the policy until such time as RMS advises the City of the proposed new permit class. When the Guidelines allow the City to offer the proposed permit, Annexure A will be presented to Council for its incorporation into the Neighbourhood Parking Policy.

**Support Worker Permits**

68. The introduction of the National Disability Insurance Scheme is bringing about substantial change within the ageing and disability services sector. There was some modification of wording to better respond to the new funding framework.
69. It is recommended that the name of the permit be changed from Care Worker Permit to Support Worker Permit and the term 'care' be replaced by 'support' to move away from medicalising disability.
70. It is recommended that the definition "an accredited health care organisation means an organisation that has accreditation or written support from one of the following: Department of Family & Community Services; NSW Department of Health; any other Commonwealth, state or non-government health body approved by the Director of City Culture and Community" be changed to "service provider means an organisation or health professional approved by a relevant professional or government body to provide in-home support to residents".

**Carers' Parking Permits**

71. There was support for reinstating the Carers' Permit for eligible residents to complement the Care Workers' permit. Some minor changes were made to the wording of the policy to clarify eligibility and respond to the changing funding framework under the National Disability Insurance Scheme. Given that the definition of 'Carer' is enshrined in legislation, the 'care' is used throughout this section of the policy for consistency and to distinguish the Carers' Parking Permit from the Support Worker Parking Permit.

72. There were some requests to extend Carers' Permits to all households, including those built with a condition of consent excluding building residents from access to the Resident Parking Scheme. This is not supported, as it is likely to increase parking pressure.

### **Motorcycle Parking**

73. The NSW Motorcycle Council expressed concern that the policy singled out motorcycles for noise and air quality impacts. The policy was amended to more clearly explain that the purpose of considering impact is due to collective impact of multiple vehicles parking in a single parking space.

### **Parklets**

74. Two submissions requested that the City devote more effort to supporting vehicular parklets (vehicle trailers modified to provide seating). Vehicular parklets do not comply with road transport legislation and the City must abide by the legislation.

### **Hardship**

75. The draft revised policy limits the waiving of policy elements on hardship grounds to be consistent with the provisions of the Schedule of Fees and Charges. There were some concerns that this could reduce flexibility of the City to respond to particular cases. It is considered that the reintroduced Carers' Permit, and amendments to the resident parking permit eligibility criteria to enable residents to obtain a permit for a vehicle not registered in their name (Section 8.2), will address these concerns.

### **Budget Implications**

76. Numerous factors impact on the uptake of the various parking permits, and detailed modelling is not available to predict the elasticity of demand, nor revenue foregone from parking meters. Overall, it is estimated that the overall impact of the proposed changes will be budget positive.
77. All comments relating to the price of parking permits and parking meter fees received as part of the community consultation for the Neighbourhood Parking Policy will be passed on to the Fees and Charges consultation process and treated as submissions to that consultation.

### **Policy Review**

78. The exhibited policy recommended a four year review. This is supported.

### **Relevant Legislation**

79. Parking permit schemes are governed by the Road Transport (General) Regulation 2013.
80. RMS Parking Permit Guidelines 2016 set out matters which need to be considered when permits schemes are developed and implemented.

### **Critical Dates / Time Frames**

81. It is proposed that changes to permits be introduced from 1 July 2018.

### **Public Consultation**

82. The draft revised policy was exhibited for 79 days. Notice of the exhibition was published in local press and on the City's website. A total of 86 submissions were received. Of these, 65 were from residents, seven were from community organisations, two were from business groups, four were from government agencies and eight were from employees of a single workplace.
83. No changes to fees will occur until 1 July 2018. In accordance with section 610F of the Local Government Act 1993, the proposed changes to the fees will be exhibited along with the City's draft operational plan as part of the annual review of fees and charges.

### **GRAHAM JAHN, AM**

Director City Planning, Development and Transport

Peter Warrington, Manager, Transport Policy, City Access and Transport

Christine Laurence, Transport Policy Analyst, City Access and Transport